

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/726,401

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carl R. Wesolowski (Attorney of Record).

(3) Tony Mahmoudi.

(2) Dov Popovici.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 September 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 2 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vaithilingam et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,724.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney of record explained the invention briefly and pointed out claim 2 as being the differentiator of this invention from the prior art patents.

The attorney pointed out the order of the steps in claim 2 as the significant differentiator of this invention in view of updating reliability and weights: "updating the reliability of the present weight by reflecting the calculated retrieval performance", and "updating the present weight using the updated reliability". The examiner pointed out that Vaithilingam et al teaches both above elements. Vaithilingam et al, in column 9, lines 56-60, states: "in step 306, the retrieval system updates the value of the meta-descriptors, for example, by assigning new weights for features, based on the human expert's input". Vaithilingam also states "steps 301, 302, 303, and 306 are repeated until the human expert is satisfied with the results, in which event the meta-descriptors are optimized and process 300 ends". The above teaching reads on the "updating the reliability of the present weight by reflecting the calculated retrieval performance" claimed in claim 2 of the present invention.

The attorney also stated that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph as a "single means claim" is inappropriate because claim 13 is not a "means" <sup>plus</sup> a "function" claim. The examiner will review claim 13 and update as appropriate in future correspondence to this application. .

D.P.  
9/4/03